



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,644	05/16/2002	Nikolaus Benninger	2034	3577
7590 04/02/2004 Striker Striker & Stenby 103 East Neck Road Huntington, NY 11743			EXAMINER MEDINA SANABRIA, MARIBEL	
			ART UNIT 1754	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/069,644	Applicant(s) BENNINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Maribel Medina	Art Unit 1754	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maribel Medina. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Zborovsky. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 16-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Murphy et al and Murachi et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see continuation sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Applicants arguments' presented on the response to the non-final action mailed on 1/19/04 are not convincing. Applicants' argue that from Murachi et al, "that the hydrogen delivery would no work". However, Murachi et al is relied upon to show that the particle filter is used in diesel engines after an oxidation reactor and Murphy et al disclose the use of hydrogen injection before an oxidation reactor in a diesel engine. The combination of the references clearly discloses the claimed invention. The fact that Murachi et al disclose a different mode for regenerating the particle filter as argued in page 10, does not preclude that the hydrogen would work in the combined reference process.